

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☐ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/461,110	12/14/1999	STAFFAN JOHANSSON	040010-585	3348
27045	7590	10/06/2004	EXAMINER	
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR C11 PLANO, TX 75024			CHOJNACKI, MELLISSA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2164	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/461,110	Applicant(s) JOHANSSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Mellissa M Chojnacki	Art Unit 2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17-May-2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) ¹⁻¹⁶~~1-20~~ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) ¹⁻¹⁶~~1-20~~ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 7-12, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,765) in view of Brodersen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,324,693).

As to claim 1, Bauer et al. teaches a method for synchronizing configuring data (See abstract; column 1, lines 50-52) at a receiving unit with corresponding source configuring data stored at a source unit (See abstract, where "client-side and server-side applications" are read on "receiving unit" and "source unit"; column 1, lines 58-67 where "client-side and server-side applications" read on "receiving unit" and "source unit"; also see column 2, lines 1-4), the configuring data and the source configuring data each being arranged in at least one group of data (See column 7, lines 62-66, where "group of tables" is read on "group of data"), the method comprises the steps of:

a) calculating reference checksums for each data group (See column 4, lines 39-49);

b) determining whether the content in each data group of the configuring data at the receiving unit matches the corresponding reference checksum (See column 4, lines 34-39, 43-49).

Bauer et al. does not teach c) downloading copies of the source configuring data in those data groups for which a mismatch was found at step b) from the source unit to the receiving unit, characterized in that step b) is performed at the receiving unit; d) requesting the source unit to transfer copies to the receiving unit of the source configuring data in those data groups for which a mismatch is found at step b), wherein step d) is performed between step b) and step c).

Brodersen et al. teaches, a method of synchronizing independently distributed software and database schema (See abstract), in which he teaches c) downloading copies of the source configuring data in those data groups for which a mismatch was found at step b) from the source unit to the receiving unit, characterized in that step b) is performed at the receiving unit (See column 9, lines 28-46);

d) requesting the source unit to transfer copies to the receiving unit of the source configuring data in those data groups for which a mismatch is found at step b), wherein step d) is performed between step b) and step c) (See column 9, lines 28-46; column 17, lines 52-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Bauer et al., to include downloading copies of the source configuring data in those data groups

Not Available Copy

for which a mismatch was found at step b) from the source unit to the receiving unit, characterized in that step b) is performed at the receiving unit; d) requesting the source unit to transfer copies to the receiving unit of the source configuring data in those data groups for which a mismatch is found at step b), wherein step d) is performed between step b) and step c).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bauer et al., by the teachings of Brodersen et al. because downloading copies of the source configuring data in those data groups for which a mismatch was found at step b) from the source unit to the receiving unit, characterized in that step b) is performed at the receiving unit; d) requesting the source unit to transfer copies to the receiving unit of the source configuring data in those data groups for which a mismatch is found at step b), wherein step d) is performed between step b) and step c), would provide a capability to maintain one or more partially-replicated copies of a central database, in such a way that the degree of replication may be easily changed without requiring a refresh of the entire replicated database, and that permits updates to be coordinated among users of the central database and users of the partially replicated databases (See Brodersen et al. column 2, lines 26-33).

As to claim 2, Bauer et al. as modified, teaches wherein the reference checksums are calculated using the content of the source configuring data at the source unit (See Bauer et al., column 4, lines 43-45, where "server" is read on

Best Available Copy

"source"; also see Brodersen et al. abstract; column 2, lines 64-67, where "configuring data" is read on "schema" and "software") and the method further comprises the step of:

e) downloading the calculated reference checksums to the receiving unit, wherein step e) is performed prior to step b) (See Brodersen et al. column 17, lines 52-67).

As to claim 3, Bauer et al. as modified teaches, wherein step b) is initiated upon detecting operation disturbances of the receiving unit (See Bauer et al., column 4, lines 34-39, 43-49; column 7, lines 39-48; column 11, lines 1-9; lines 43-48, where "server" is read on "source unit" and "client" is read on "receiving unit").

As to claim 4, Bauer et al. as modified, teaches wherein step b) is performed repeatedly (See Bauer et al., column 4, 40-55; also see Brodersen et al. column 9, lines 60-67; column 10, lines 1-14; column 17, lines 52-67).

As to claim 7, Bauer et al. as modified, teaches wherein step b) comprises the steps of:

f) performing checksum calculations for each data group of the configuring data at the receiving unit (See Bauer et al., column 4, lines 46-49, where "client" is read on "receiving unit"; column 9, lines 34-41, where "client table" is read on

"data group"; column 10, lines 23-33; column 11, lines 43-48. Also see also Brodersen et al. column 17, lines 52-67);

g) comparing the calculated checksums to the corresponding reference checksums (See Bauer et al., column 10, lines 20-24).

As to claim 8, Bauer et al. as modified, teaches wherein the data groups are classified according to the urgency of the content of each data group with respect to the operation of the receiving unit (See Bauer et al., column 7, lines 34-48; also see Brodersen et al. column 4, lines 66-67; column 5, lines 1-13) and step c) is performed so that copies of the source configuring data in data groups classified as more urgent are downloaded prior to downloading copies of the source configuring data in data groups classified as less urgent (See Bauer et al., column 7, lines 34-48; also see Brodersen et al. column 4, lines 66-67; column 5, lines 1-13).

As to claim 9, Bauer et al. teaches, a distributed system (See abstract, where "share" is read on "distributed") comprising a receiving unit, a source unit (See abstract, where "client-side and server-side applications" are read on "receiving unit" and "source unit"; column 1, lines 58-67 where "client-side and server-side applications" read on "receiving unit" and "source unit"; Also see column 2, lines 1-4) and data transfer means interconnecting the receiving unit and the source unit (See column 6, lines 41-45, where "communication network" is read on "data transfer means"), wherein the receiving unit includes first storage

means for storing configuring data and the source unit includes second storage means for storing corresponding source configuring data (See column 8, lines 58-60; column 28, lines 45-54), the configuring data and the source configuring data each being arranged in at least one group of data (See column 7, line 67; column 8, lines 1-2, where "group of tables" is read on "group of data"), the distributed system comprises:

reference checksum calculating means for calculating reference checksums for each data group (See column 4, lines 39-49);

determining means for determining whether the content in each data group of the configuring data at the receiving unit matches the corresponding reference checksum (See column 4, lines 34-39, 43-49);

Bauer et al. does not teach downloading means for downloading copies from the source unit to the receiving unit of the source configuring data in those data groups for which the determining means has found a mismatch between the content of the configuring data at the receiving unit and the corresponding reference checksums; characterized in that the determining means is located at the receiving unit and that the distributed system comprises means for requesting the source unit to download copies of the source configuring data in those data groups for which the determining means found a mismatch.

Brodersen et al. teaches, a method of synchronizing independently distributed software and database schema (See abstract), in which he teaches downloading means for downloading copies from the source unit to the receiving unit of the source configuring data in those data groups for which the determining

means has found a mismatch between the content of the configuring data at the receiving unit and the corresponding reference checksums (See column 9, lines 28-46);

characterized in that the determining means is located at the receiving unit and that the distributed system comprises means for requesting the source unit to download copies of the source configuring data in those data groups for which the determining means found a mismatch (See column 9, lines 28-46; column 17, lines 52-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Bauer et al., to include downloading means for downloading copies from the source unit to the receiving unit of the source configuring data in those data groups for which the determining means has found a mismatch between the content of the configuring data at the receiving unit and the corresponding reference checksums; characterized in that the determining means is located at the receiving unit and that the distributed system comprises means for requesting the source unit to download copies of the source configuring data in those data groups for which the determining means found a mismatch.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bauer et al., by the teachings of Brodersen et al. because downloading means for downloading copies from the source unit to the receiving unit of the source configuring data in those data groups for which the determining means has found a mismatch between the

content of the configuring data at the receiving unit and the corresponding reference checksums; characterized in that the determining means is located at the receiving unit and that the distributed system comprises means for requesting the source unit to download copies of the source configuring data in those data groups for which the determining means found a mismatch would provide a capability to maintain one or more partially-replicated copies of a central database, in such a way that the degree of replication may be easily changed without requiring a refresh of the entire replicated database, and that permits updates to be coordinated among users of the central database and users of the partially replicated databases (See Brodersen et al. column 2, lines 26-33).

As to claim 10, Bauer et al. as modified, teaches wherein the reference checksum calculating means is located in the source unit and is adapted to calculate the reference checksums using the content of the source configuring data stored in the second storage means (See Bauer et al., column 4, lines 40-54), and the downloading means is adapted to download the calculated reference checksums from the source unit to the receiving unit (See Bauer et al., column 4, lines 46-49, where "client" is read on "receiving unit"; column 9, lines 34-41, where "client table" is read on "data group"; column 10, lines 23-33; column 11, lines 43-48; also see Brodersen et al. column 17, lines 52-67).

As to claim 11, Bauer et al. as modified, teaches wherein the determining means is adapted to determine whether the content in each data group of the

configuring data at the receiving unit matches the corresponding reference checksum upon detection of operation disturbances of the receiving unit (See Bauer et al., column 4, lines 34-39, 43-49; column 7, lines 39-48; column 11, lines 1-9; lines 43-48, where “server” is read on “source unit” and “client” is read on “receiving unit”).

As to claim 12, Bauer et al. as modified, teaches wherein the determining means is adapted to repeatedly perform monitoring cycles determining whether the content, in each data group of the configuring data at the receiving unit matches the corresponding reference checksum (See Bauer et al., column 4, lines 46-49, where “client” is read on “receiving unit”; column 9, lines 34-41, where “client table” is read on “data group”; column 10, lines 23-33; column 11, lines 43-48; also see Brodersen et al. column 17, lines 52-67).

As to claim 15, Bauer et al. as modified, teaches wherein the determining means comprises: checksum calculating means for calculating checksums for each data group of the configuring data at the receiving unit comparing means for comparing the checksums calculated by the checksum calculating means to the corresponding reference checksums (See Bauer et al., column 4, lines 46-49, where “client” is read on “receiving unit”; column 9, lines 34-41, where “client table” is read on “data group”; column 7, lines 45-48; and column 10, lines 25-28; also see Brodersen et al. column 17, lines 52-67).

As to claim 16, Bauer et al. as modified, teaches wherein the data groups are classified according to the urgency of the content of each data group with respect to the operation of the receiving unit and the downloading means is adopted to download copies of the source configuring data in data groups classified as more urgent prior to downloading copies of the source configuring data in data groups classified as less urgent (See Brodersen et al. column 4, lines 66-67; column 5, lines 1-13).

3. Claims 5-6, and 13-14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Bauer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,765) in view of Brodersen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,324,693), as applied to claims 1-4, 7-12, and 15-16 above, and in further view of Nishida et al., (U.S. Patent No. 4,541,091).

As to claim 5, Bauer et al. as modified, teaches wherein step b) is initiated (See Bauer et al., column 4, lines 34-39, 43-49).

Bauer et al. as modified, does not teach periodically with a predetermined time interval between each cycle.

Nishida et al. teaches a predetermined time interval between each cycle (See column 4, lines 49-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Bauer et al., as modified, to include periodically with a predetermined time interval between each cycle.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bauer et al., as modified, by the teachings of Nishida et al. al. because periodically with a predetermined time interval between each cycle would help avoid unnecessary redundancies during the synchronization of data amongst networking systems and detect error rate (See Nishida et al., column 4, lines 49-55).

As to claim 6, Bauer et al. as modified, teaches wherein the data groups of the configuring data at the receiving unit are divided into at least two subsets (See Bauer et al., column 8, lines 58-60, where "client" is read on "receiving") and step b) is initiated periodically for each subset with predetermined time intervals between each cycle (See Bauer et al., column 4, lines 34-39, 43-49; also see Nishida et al., column 4, lines 49-55), the predetermined time intervals being selected individually for each respective subset (See Nishida et al., column 4, lines 49-55).

As to claim 13, Bauer et al. as modified, teaches wherein the determining means is adapted to periodically initiate the monitoring cycles with a predetermined time interval between each monitoring cycle (See Nishida et al., column 4, lines 49-55).

As to claim 14, Bauer et al. as modified, teaches wherein the data groups of the configuring data at the receiving unit are divided into at least two subsets

(See Bauer et al., column 8, lines 58-60, where "client" is read on "receiving") and the determining means is adapted to periodically initiate the monitoring cycles for each subset with predetermined time intervals between each monitoring cycle, the predetermined time intervals being selected individually for each respective subset (See Bauer et al., column 8, lines 58-60, where "client" is read on "receiving"; also see Nishida et al., column 4, lines 49-55).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments in Response to the Office Action mailed February 17, 2004, for the application filed 12-December-1999, with respect to objection to the specification and objections to the drawings have been fully considered and are persuasive.

5. Applicant's arguments filed on May 17, 2004, for the application filed 12-December-1999, with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mellissa M. Chojnacki whose telephone number is 730-305-8769. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 703-305-3830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mmc
September 30, 2004


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER